

Atty. Dkt. No. 99CR065/KE

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the present application in view of the foregoing amendments and in view of the reasons which follow. Claims 1-12 stand rejected. Claims 13-20 have been added. No new matter is added. Accordingly, Claims 1-20 remain pending in the application.

In paragraphs 1-3 of the Office Action, Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,926,246 (Tomita). The Examiner states:

Tomita discloses and shows in Figure 5, an apparatus for repairing defect in a normally white liquid crystal display, the apparatus comprising:

- pixel defect location means for identifying a location of a defected pixel; and
- ablation means for ablating a portion of the color filter corresponding to the location of the defective pixel.

Accordingly, Claim 12 is clearly anticipated.

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

In paragraphs 4-6 of the Office Action, Claims 1-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Tomita. Examiner states:

Tomita discloses a method for repairing defects in a normally white liquid crystal display (col. 1, line 7-11; col. 6, line 33-34, method comprising:

- locating a defective pixel in the liquid crystal display;
- focusing a laser on a portion of a color filter corresponding to the defective pixel; and
- at least partially ablating the portion of the color filter corresponding to the defective pixel using the laser.

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection. Tomita is referred to below as the cited art.

Atty. Dkt. No. 99CR065/KE

Each of independent Claims 1, 8, and 12 recites a feature in which a portion of the color filter is ablated to correct a defective pixel. Claim 1 recites:

focusing a laser on a portion of a color filter corresponding to the defective pixel; and

at least partially ablating the portion of the color filter corresponding to the defective pixel using the laser.

Claim 8 recites:

a controller adapted to control the laser to ablate a portion of the color filter corresponding to a location of each defective pixel.

Claim 12 recites:

ablation means for ablating a portion of a color filter corresponding to the location of the defective filter.

The ablation of the filter is discussed throughout the present application. For example, the Summary of the Invention in the present application states that the "laser is used to darken the defective pixel by focusing on a color filter of the defective pixel." After a portion of the color filter is darkened, a minor defect exists instead of a major defect. See present application, page 3, lines 8-12. Further, the application states that "ablation of a pixel is accomplished by discoloring the corresponding portion of the color filter." See present application, page 7, lines 12 and 13. By discoloring the filter, less damage is possible to the glass substrate. See present application, pages 8 and 9. Therefore, each of independent claims 1, 8, and 12 recites an advantageous feature related to the ablation of the color filter.

In direct contrast to the present invention, Tomita does not disclose ablation of a color filter. Indeed, Tomita merely discloses that the laser beam can burn "defective pixel electrode 9, the opposing electrode 15 which faces the defective electrode 9, and aligning films 14 and 14 of the liquid crystal panel (areas with mesh pattern in Figure 2) . . ." Tomita, col. 7, lines 30-35. In fact, Tomita, follows an entirely different principle in which the defective liquid crystal cell is reoriented so that incident light is blocked by the pixel rather than discoloring the color filter.

See, Tomita, Figures 8A and 8B and col. 10, lines 34-49. Accordingly, there is no suggestion in Tomita for the ablating of the color filter as recited in independent claims 1, 8,

Atty. Dkt. No. 99CR065/KE

and 12. Accordingly, Claim 1, and its dependent Claims 2-7, claim 8 and its dependent claims 9-11, and claim 12 and its dependent Claims 13-20 are patentable over the cited art.

Various dependent claims recite features which are not shown, described in the cited art. Claims 3 and 14 recite the use of a color vision system. Tomita does not even mention colored pixels, much less the use of a color vision system to analyze pixels. There is no discussion Tomita of any sort of location systems for the defective pixels. Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner cite a reference for the use of the color vision system in accordance with MPEP Section 2144.03. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that Claims 3 and 14 are additionally patentable over the cited art.

Further, Claims 4-6 and 15-18 recite further features related to the ablation of the color filter. As discussed above, ablation of a portion of the color filter is not shown, described or suggested in the cited art, much less the additional features recited in dependent Claims 4-6 and 15-18. Accordingly, Claims 4-6 and 15-18 are additionally patentable over the cited art.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

Respectfully submitted,

Date November 7, 2002

By Kyle Epple

ROCKWELL COLLINS, INC.
400 Collins Road, NE
Cedar Rapids, IA 52498
Telephone: (319) 295-8280
Facsimile: (319) 295-8777
Customer No.: 26383

Kyle Epple
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 34,155

FAX RECEIVED

NOV 07 2002

TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800